BEFORE THE

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

OFFICE OF ENERGY PROJECTS

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -x

COMMENTS on the DRAFT :

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT : FERC No. 2105

STATEMENT for the UPPER :

NORTH FORK FEATHER RIVER :

PROJECT, CALIFORNIA :

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -x

Veteran's Memorial Hall

225 Gay Street

Chester, California 96020

Tuesday, October 19, 2004

The above-entitled matter came on pursuant to notice at 6:11 p.m.

BEFORE:

JOHN MUDRE, Facilitator
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, N.E., Room 51-19
Washington, D. C. 20426

From The Louis Berger Group, Inc., Contractor:

Frankie Green, Senior Environmental Scientist
655 Cherokee Heights Road
Tallassee, Alabama 36078
(334) 857-3595, voice/fax

Brian Mattax, Senior Aquatic Scientist
12011 Bellevue-Redmond Road, Suite 200
Bellevue, Washington 98005-2471
(425) 467-6111, ext. 132, voice; 451-7800, fax

From the Applicant, Pacific Gas & Electric Company:

Thomas A. Jereb, Senior Project Manager
Scott Tu, Ph.D.
Hydro Generation Department
Mail Code N11D
P. O. Box 770000
San Francisco, California 94177-0001
(415) 973-9320, voice; 973-5323, fax

I N D E X

P R O C E E D I N G S

(6:11 p.m.)

MR. MUDRE: All right. We have a good crowd here tonight. I want to thank everyone for coming. My name is John Mudre, and I'm with the Federal Regulatory Energy Commission. I'm on the staff of the Commission. With me up here tonight are Frankie Green and Brian Mattax. And they're on the Commission's support contractor for preparing our environmental documents. And they helped us prepare the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

The purpose of tonight's meeting is to get your comments on the Draft EIS and to tell you how you could also provide us comments in writing. We're going to have a few added surprises along the way, I think, too.

But I want to start out by just telling you a little bit about the Federal Regulatory Energy Commission and what we do and kind of how we do it. So we'll start with that.

The FERC is an independent agency, independent federal agency, that regulates electric power, natural gas, oil pipelines, and the hydroelectric industry. The Commission is composed of five Commissioners that are appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. And the President designates the Chairman of the Commission.

Like I said, the Commission administers the

nonfederal hydropower projects, not the Corps of Engineers or BOF projects, but just the nonfederal projects.

The part of FERC that deals with the hydroelectric industry is composed of three divisions. We have the one group that issues licenses and relicenses the projects. And that's the group that I'm in.

We also have the Hydropower Compliance and Administration Group. And what they do is, after a license is issued, they sort of track the project and make sure that the licensee is doing everything that the license says that they need to do. If they want to amend the license, they are the people that do license amendments. They're the ones that review the plans and reports that are done pursuant to a license once its issued.

We also have a very active Dam Safety and Inspection Program. Some of you may know that we required the strengthening of two of this project's dams back in, I think, 1996 and 1997 for seismic remediation because PG&E's studies show that they would -- at least one of them wouldn't survive the maximum credible earthquake. So they've been fixed and they're in good shape at this point. But they're continually inspected and, if they need something, it gets done.

Our main office is in Washington, D.C. And we have five regional offices. The San Francisco Regional

Office has oversight for the Upper North Fork Feather River Project.

Again, we issue licenses for hydropower projects. And under the Federal Power Act we have the authority to issue licenses for terms of between 30 and 50 years. The licensed projects must serve the public interest. We don't just consider electric generation, but we need to consider a broad range of resource issues, including recreation, cultural resources, all sorts of thing. We have to balance the pluses and minuses of different proposals.

I'm just going to give a brief overview of the licensing process so that you can kind of get a feel for where we are in this case. It starts out when an applicant files a license application. Once that comes in, we look it over and make sure it's adequate, that all the parts are there that need to be there. If they're not, we ask for the additional information that we need.

Once we have all the information we need, we begin our environmental review process which, in most cases, is the preparation of an environmental impact statement. We do draft EISs, which we send out for comments. And then based on the comments, we make changes to and then issue a FEIS.

The Commission uses the EIS to decide whether and under what conditions to issue a license for the project.

Once the Commission issues a license, the applicant must decide whether or not they want to accept it. And once the license is accepted and in force, they can be amended or changed after that by filing an amendment application or through something known as a reopener process. So there are ways of changing what's in a license after it's issued.

Fortunately or unfortunately, depending on your point of view, we're not the only agency that says what could be in a license. There are other agencies who have the ability to place conditions on a license and the Commission has no discretion to change those conditions.

Examples would be Forest Service 4(E) conditions that -- it's sort of for the protection of Forest Service lands. Another is the Department of Interior and the National Fishery Service can prescribe fish passage facilities. And if they do that, we have to require it.

Another big one is the State Water Resources Control Board has to issue a water quality certificate before we can issue a hydropower license. And they have conditions to their water quality certificates. And we have to include those conditions in the new license.

Ideally, these recommendations and mandatory conditions are considered in our environmental impact statement, but sometimes they're not because, oftentimes, particularly with the water quality certificates from the

State Water Resources Control Board, we don't -- they like to look at our documents before they put their conditions together. And sometimes they have to do their own analyses, because issuing a water quality certificate is a discretionary act by a state agency. They have responsibilities under the California Environmental Quality Act, and they may have to do an EIR, environmental impact statement.

So we don't always -- everything that's going to be in the license is not necessarily analyzed in our final EIS. If something does pop up that looks like it's going to have a good potential to have major unexpected impacts, we can do the supplements to our EIS, or something like that, to take that into account.

Scott, can you go back one?

Now these mandatory conditions, as I said, we can't change them. However, most of them can be appealed in either the courts or the different agencies have an appeal process that can be gone through if someone wants to appeal one of these mandatory conditions.

Okay. This is probably why most of you are here tonight. And I wanted to say a few things about the thermal curtain, or what's come to be known as the thermal curtain.

As background, in the relicensing of the Rock Creek-Cresta Project, which is down the Feather River a bit,

PG&E agreed to study and to potentially implement measures to provide cooler water to the Rock Creek and Cresta reaches of the North Fork Feather River.

In its licensing order, the Commission said: Well, you can agree to do that in your Settlement Agreement, but we're not going to include it in the Rock Creek-Cresta license, because some of the measures that they were talking about, such as the modification of the Prattville Intake, affect another FERC project. So the Commission didn't include that in the Rock Creek-Cresta license. They had to do something to the Prattville Intake.

In fact, what the Commission said was that any modifications to the Upper North Fork Feather River Project must be considered in the context of that project. Now that could occur either in this relicensing process, or it could occur after a license is issued as a license amendment proceeding.

I think the main thing or a very important thing to consider is that as of this time we have received no proposal from PG&E to modify the Prattville Intake. Okay. If and when we receive that proposal to modify the Upper North Fork Feather River Project facility, the operation, what we would do would be to issue a public notice that we've received this proposal and later request public comments on that proposal.

We would then conduct an independent environmental analysis to look at the pluses and minuses of the proposal and then decide whether or not this is something that should be approved and become part of the license. And that's it for the introductory material that I wanted to provide.

What we're going to do right now, Frankie is going to briefly go through a presentation that talks about from a little different perspective the licensing proceeding here, how we got to this point, talk a little bit about the DEIS. And at this point I'm going to turn it over to Frankie.

MS. GREEN: Thank you, John.

As John mentioned, we're here to talk about the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Upper North Fork Feather River Project. This is just a brief agenda. We have already done introductions. We're going to talk a little bit -- I guess John has already talked about the purpose of the meeting. I want to talk a little bit about the history of this proceeding, how we got to this point where the Draft EIS has been issued, the basis for our analysis in this DEIS, and our conclusions, and what happens next, what's next in the Draft EIS process.

So the purpose of our meeting tonight is to receive oral and written comments and recommendations from

those of you in the public, as well as agencies and other nongovernmental organizations on the Draft EIS. So how did we get here?

Here are some key milestones in the process of the Upper North Fork Feather River Project Relicensing. On October 23rd, 2002, PG&E filed their application to relicense this project. On December 26, 2002, FERC issued the notice accepting the application and also asked for any motions to intervene or protest.

On April 25th, 2003, FERC issued Scoping Document 1 to identify issues and alternatives that would be considered in this Draft EIS. At that time, some of you may remember, we had a meeting in May. On May 20th and 21st we had a site visit and scoping meetings to talk about what we would be analyzing in the EIS.

After looking at everything we had on the record and looking at comments that came in, on June 23rd, 2003, FERC issued an additional information request. We decided there were some things that we needed to hear about and know about in order to do a more thorough analysis. And in the summer of 2003, PG&E provided that information that we requested.

However, in August of 2003 FERC issued Scoping Document 2, which addressed the comments on Scoping Document 1. On August 25th, 2003, after all the responses to the

additional information had come in, FERC issued their Ready for Environmental Analysis Notice, meaning we had everything we needed; we were going to go forward with this Draft EIS.

On March 5th, 2004, PG&E filed the Draft Project 2105 Relicensing Settlement Agreement. We had heard about that when we were out here for our scoping meetings that there were collaborative discussions taking place and we were pleased to see something come in so that we were not just operating in a vacuum. We were very interested in what the Collaborative Group had to say.

And on April 30th, 2004, PG&E actually filed the signed Final Project 2105 Relicensing Settlement Agreement. PG&E also made it clear at that time that there were certain issues that had not been addressed in that Settlement Agreement, including water temperature.

On September 7th of this year, PG&E withdrew its request for Water Quality Certification. As I mentioned earlier, that in order to license a project we have to see a water quality certificate from the state indicating that the project is in compliance with the Clean Water Act.

And the application for a water quality certification is only good for one year. So PG&E withdrew that application and refiled it, and that started the one-year clock for the State Water Resources Control Board to take action.

On September 13th of this year, the Draft EIS was issued. On September 14th, right after this Draft EIS went out, FERC requested a Biological Opinion from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. That has to be done under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act.

If any of you have had an opportunity to read the Draft EIS, you know there are some endangered species that may be affected by this project.

September 15th, FERC issued the public notice of the Settlement Agreement that had been filed by PG&E in April and requested comments on that Settlement Agreement. And also on that day FERC sent a letter to the U.S. Department of Interior to resolve potential inconsistencies with Section 10(J) of the Federal Power Act.

And then today we're here for the public meetings on the Draft EIS today. And then tomorrow afternoon we'll be meeting in Chico.

So I want to talk a little bit about the basis of our analysis and our conclusions in the Draft EIS.

The National Environmental Policy Act or NEPA requires FERC to conduct an independent analysis of environmental issues. Our analysis considered the water quality, fish and wildlife, recreation, and other nondevelopmental values. Cultural resources and socioeconomics were also considered in our Draft EIS of the

waterway equally with electric energy and other developmental values.

Strong consideration was given to the protection, mitigation, and enhancement measures that were included in the Project 2105 Relicensing Settlement Agreement. And our conclusions and recommendations are included in the Draft EIS are based on the public record for this project, information that we had received throughout that whole process that I just went through.

There were three alternatives we considered in this Draft EIS. The first one was the proposed action that PG&E had filed as part of its license application and also in the Settlement Agreement.

And then we looked at the Staff-Recommended Alternative, which was basically PG&E's proposed action with some additional staff-recommended environmental measures, things we came up with on our own, based on our analysis.

And we also looked at a No-Action Alternative. And what that actually means is that the project would continue as it currently operates; nothing would be changed. But it doesn't mean the project would go away; it just means that it would be as-is, status quo.

So if anybody is interested in seeing the information we looked at, what's on the public record for this project, you can go to FERC online at that address

right up there, www.ferc.gov. And using their eLibrary link, it's pretty self-explanatory if you ever go their site. Just select general search and enter the docket number. The docket number for this project is P-2105. And then just follow the instructions on the screen. However, if you have problems there is a phone number that you can use to get some assistance.

This is the location of the project. I think most of you are very familiar with the project location. Just a brief overview: Lake Almanor is the uppermost reservoir. Butt Valley Reservoir is below that. And then there's a small forebay down at the Belden, down at Belden. And there were five powerhouses involved: Butt Valley Powerhouse, Caribou Powerhouses 1 and 2, Oak Flat Powerhouse, and the Belden Powerhouse.

So what happens next? Comments on the Draft EIS, which you're welcome to make in writing if you don't care to say anything tonight orally. They are due on November 1st. Comments on the Settlement Agreement are also due November 1st.

We're expecting to get a 10-day response from Interior. There were some inconsistencies with the Federal Power Act the way we did their recommendations. Those are due from them on November 1st. We hope to resolve all these 10(j) issues by December of this year. The Biological

Opinion from the Fish and Wildlife Service is due January 31st, 2005. If everything happens like we say or like we expect it to, we should issue a Final EIS in the spring of 2005, hopefully in March of 2005.

However, we don't when the water quality certificate will be issued. And as John mentioned, we can't -- FERC cannot issue a license without that water quality certification.

Final 4(E) conditions should be filed by the Forest Service in the spring, sometime after the Final Environmental Impact Statement. Once we have a water quality certificate, as well as the final 4(E) conditions, the license order will be issued.

If you'd like to receive a copy of the Draft EIS, we do have some available up here. Unfortunately, we don't have as many as we'd hoped. Some things didn't seem to make it in the mail, but we do have some, or you can contact FERC. There's a phone number up there. You can contact Susan Dupree at FERC, or you may email her. And there's no charge for the Draft EIS. They will send it to you free of charge, or you may contact John Mudre if you have any questions about the relicensing. John's phone number is up there.

So just more point. Comments are due on the Draft EIS no later than November 1st, 2004. If you do

decide to file written comments, please make sure you put the docket number at the top of your first page of your filing. That's Project Number 2105-089. That way it gets filed in the correct public record. And you submit all comments to the Secretary of the Commission. That's Magalie Salas. And the address for the Commission is up there. It's also available in the Draft EIS.

MR. MUDRE: Thank you, Frankie.

I know there was a lot of information on some of those slides at the end. The addresses and instructions for filing comments on the Draft EIS and on the Settlement Agreement are contained in the notices that we've issued. So they're available on our website, or some people may have copies. I think what I'll also do is maybe give Bill Dennison a copy of this presentation. And then he can get the information to whoever wants it. And we'll do that, too.

Yes.

MR. DYOK: Wayne Dyok, consultant. Could I ask a question regarding that schedule. John, you last said there --

THE REPORTER: Excuse me. Could you come to the mic?

MR. DYOK: Oh, I'm sorry.

MR. MUDRE: Yes. I'll explain something about

the mics here and a few other issues, maybe, at this point.

We have a court reporter here today who is making a record of the comments that people give us, so we can make sure we accurately get these comments put into the record so we can use them in this proceeding.

MR. DYOK: Wayne Dyok. When do you use that --

MR. MUDRE: I was going to get to that.

MR. DYOK: Oh, I'm sorry.

MR. MUDRE: He can't hear you, either.

So to do that, she has an array of microphones here. Half of them on this table and at that podium, those microphones are only hooked into her machine.

The only microphone we have that amplifies voices is the one I'm holding in my hand here. So the questions and answers are going to be -- I'm going to just pass this back and forth. But when it comes time to take comments, we'll move this mic down to the podium here.

When you do give any comments here, what you'll need to do is provide your name and maybe spell it, if it's not apparent to the court reporter so she can make sure she gets that into the record properly, too. Speak slowly, or she'll probably raise your hand, or something, if you start speaking too fast, because it's important that we record this and get it right.

MR. DYOK: (Speaking out of range of the

microphone.)

MR. MUDRE: Are you trying to quiet me down?

MR. DYOK: No, no. I was just trying to help you.

(Laughter.)

MR. DYOK: My name is Wayne Dyok, D-y-o-k. I'm a consultant to Plumas County, and I'd like to ask a clarification question.

On the schedule I believe, Frankie, you had mentioned that the Final EIS would be due around March of 2005, assuming you can deal with the 10(J), the 4(E), and the Biological Opinion.

MS. GREEN: Yes.

MR. DYOK: If you do not have one but you have all the other items wrapped up, would you -- would the Commission still issue its FEIS in March of 2005?

MR. MUDRE: Yes, we will. We don't -- it's not our practice to wait around until we have a water quality certificate to finish our environmental analysis. So it's not unusual for us to issue our EIS before we get the water quality certificate. It's unfortunate, but that's the way it is.

Let's see. I think at this point what might be useful is I'm going to ask Tom Jereb of PG&E to give everyone here, including myself, and Frankie, and Brian an update on exactly what is the status of what's been referred

to as the thermal curtain or measures to provide colder water downstream in the North Fork Feather River.

Again, this was something they agreed to do as part of Rock Creek-Cresta relicensing. I know they've been having lots of meetings and doing studies. We're not exactly sure, you know, where they are in the process. So we'd like to hear. And I'm sure that probably there are a lot of people that would also like to find out what's going on with that. So, do you want to come up here and sit down, or do you want to talk on the podium. Where do you want to speak?

MR. JEREB: Why don't I come up there.

MR. MUDRE: You can have my seat for a while.

MR. JEREB: Yes. I'll sit next to Frankie.

Again, my name is Tom Jereb. It's spelled J-e-r-e-b. And I'm with Pacific Gas and Electric. I manage the relicensing projects on the Feather River. I have a little slide show here, about a ten-minute slide show, to give you an update, John, of what we're doing to look out the feasibility of obtaining cold water on the North Fork of the Feather River. This is the first time you have seen any of this, so I'm trying to be brief and basic.

The background for this, as you mentioned, is that we've been evaluating the feasibility of obtaining cold water on the North Fork of the Feather River as a part of

the relicensing for not only the Upper North Fork Feather River, but the Rock Creek-Cresta Project, and the Poe Projects, three particular projects on the Feather River.

Currently the North Fork Feather River water temperatures are affected by our operations. And water temperature has been a major issue with the resource agencies involved in relicensing.

Those agencies include, as you mentioned earlier, the State Water Resources Control Board, which is a principal-controlling agency because of their 401 certificate issuance; the California State Department of Fish and Game; the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; the U.S. Forest Service; the National Park Service; and, lastly, the National Marine Fisheries. So those agencies we're involved with in our Collaborative Group, which has been ongoing for over two years.

In the last year or so, we've been looking at this water-temperature issue and doing -- we've had many meetings on that. As you mentioned earlier, the principal driver of this is our Rock Creek-Cresta recently-issued FERC license. Also included we have a Settlement Agreement for the Rock Creek-Cresta Project which was signed in the year 2000.

In that Rock Creek-Cresta license, there's a condition within that that we're ordered to reasonably

protect the cold water fish habitat by maintaining a 20-degree Centigrade, Celsius, or less in the Rock Creek and Cresta reaches to the extent that the licensee can reasonably control such measures. So this is the goal that we're trying to achieve and look at as how to achieve that.

MR. MUDRE: John Mudre here. All right. Could you back up one slide, Scott? Okay.

Now is that a license condition, or are you talking about a condition of the Settlement Agreement?

MR. JEREB: It's a license condition. This is in the --

MS. GREEN: Is that license condition, is that reflected in the water quality certification, as well, or is that something that was just given to you by FERC?

MR. JEREB: It was something that was given to us by FERC. There is no water quality certification on the Rock Creek-Cresta because of a one-year expiration date, which the Water Board failed to meet.

MR. MUDRE: Yes, that's correct.

MR. JEREB: There is no certificate on that.

So this is what our license for the Rock Creek-Cresta Project requires us to do.

In the Settlement Agreement that accompanied that license we agreed to look at the Prattville Intake and look at any kind of measures that we could do to try and attempt

to get colder water from downstream. And we've done that. And we have seven different studies that have been done. And those results -- and you have not seen any of those. Our Collaborative Group is reviewing those and the information within those.

Let me tell you a little bit about Lake Almanor, just a little background for you about it. Here's an old profile of the lake. The left-hand lobe here is a shallow lobe. The right-hand lobe is a deeper area. The dam is down here on the lower right side down here. Our intake for the power intakes are over here called Prattville. There's a channel that was dug out in the lake that goes out this way to help get water from this deeper lobe over here into this area.

So this is a general configuration of the lake. It's a deeper part out in this area, much shallower up in this area.

Next slide, Scott.

How is the water temperature affected in the lake? From top to bottom and from one location to the next. Next slide, Scott.

We've done water-quality sampling in the lake at these various locations. And the next slide will show the results of these locations. These are profiles done in each of those locations in June and July. What we see here are

the lake -- each of those locations, at each point it's very homogeneous.

This is how, as we get deeper in the lake, it becomes colder, and colder, and colder. The thermocline, which is an area about 30 feet deep, is a subject area that we've been discussing with our Collaborative Group, because it's an area in which the colder-water fish like to reside. It contains cold water and it also contains dissolved oxygen enough for them to breathe and live. Next slide, Scott.

This stratification, as any typical lake, begins in early summer. It's fully developed by mid-summer. And, finally in the fall, when it cools down, the lake turns over and the lake becomes isothermal. Very typical for any large lake and reservoir.

In evaluating, we have a consultant team made up of ourselves, Bechtel, University of Iowa, Black and Veatch, Jones and Stokes, and Tom Payne and Associates. Again, as I said, we've got seven different studies that have been ongoing and are complete.

We've evaluated here at Lake Almanor three various alternatives: A floating curtain alternative; we've evaluated a submerged hooded pipe; and last we've evaluated dredging some channel work out in the lake. In that earlier slide I highlighted, there's a man-made channel out into the lake.

When they built that back in the early 1900s, they took the material and just put it up on the bank. And so what it's doing is it's inhibiting some of the cold water to be able to get to the Prattville Intake.

A major study that we did was done by the University of Iowa. And they did hydraulic modeling and numerical modeling of this area in Lake Almanor. Next slide, Scott.

Here's some slides of them making this model back at the University of Iowa. It's a full-scale model, something like a swimming pool about two or three feet deep. We built the contours of that section of the lake, plumbed it with heating and cooling elements. Next slide, Scott.

And here's what it ended up looking like. The intake's over in this right-hand area over here. And so we were able to use this model with inflowing water at various temperatures to model this intake to see if we could, indeed, design some kind of structure to get colder water out of the lake.

This floating curtain idea, it's not unusual. This is one that's up here in a lake in California, Whiskeytown. This is a curtain that would be very similar in size to the one that we're evaluating. These are two slides of it. These are floating steel tanks with the curtain suspended underneath this that lays down into the

lake. And the object of it is to get colder water going underneath it.

Our evaluation, we've looked at various alternatives. Curtain number 4 seems to be the most efficient curtain. It's 900 feet out in the lake and about 700 feet wide. This is the channel going into the lake. There's these dikes that I mentioned here. We have a dredging option of dredging these dikes. There's about 24,000 cubic yards of dredging in one of the alternatives that we're looking at.

This is an aerial shot showing the curtain in here. This chunk out here is just a void in the arrow. It's not the peninsula. This shows the curtain overlaid on this aerial in the intake area. Again, 900 feet out in the lake and about 700 feet wide. This land is all owned by PG&E. In perspective you can see the marina just to the upper side of it. This is the log boom that goes out on that marina.

Yes, indeed, this is a large structure out into the lake and will be visible and have some visual impacts associated with it. Here's an aerial of the entire lake and showing it on here in this area right here.

Now the modeling results, the numerical and physical model shows that -- we ask ourselves: Can this thing be effective? And the answer we come up with the

model: Yes, it can. We currently have about 21 degrees of water withdrawal in August coming out of the lake at those intakes, that Prattville. The curtain number 4 with the levees removed, we can get it down to 16 degrees. These were the other options that we looked at, and you can see that it's less effective.

So we focused in on this curtain number 4 with the levee removal. Here's a profile within the lake of what's going to happen to the lake with this alternative. On the right hand it shows temperatures in the lake. And we've concluded that the lake surface area would warm up from zero to one-half degrees Centigrade on an average.

We've concluded that the thermocline in this area, in which the cold-water fish live and reside, would drop anywhere from zero to ten feet. On the left-hand side over here this is the dissolved oxygen in the lake. It looks like the dissolved oxygen would increase just slightly, not too much on the surface. The thermocline would be dropping. And so the dissolved oxygen would follow this simulated-web curtain, this solid line here.

So there are some impacts related to these proposals that we're looking at. Our findings to date have been that there -- of course, as I mentioned, there is annual stratification of the lake. And this occurs each and every year.

In the summertime the reservoir's physical habitat is confined to this thermocline. This is for cold water. It's very important. We define this cold water, thermocline physical habitat for cold-water fish as dissolved oxygen greater than five parts per million and temperature less than 22 degrees Centigrade. So that's where they live in this window.

We have some volumes which we defined within that. We, as I mentioned earlier, our modeling -- we have not changed in any of our modeling any of the lake-level elevations that are prescribed in our Settlement Agreement with our Collaborative Group. So our models run with those prescripted lake levels.

As I mentioned earlier, the thermocline would be lowered from zero to ten feet. The water surface temperature would be increased from zero to .5 degrees Centigrade.

We've had some conclusions about this thermocline and the surface-water temperatures. They're within the normal variation of what the lake has seen in the last 33 years' worth of records.

The curtain induces, we believe, insignificant changes in the cold water physical habitat when compared to this natural seasonal variation. It's not to say that they may be more frequent, but they may be insignificant. But we

are discussing that with our Collaborative Group of what is significant and what is not significant.

And, lastly, that downstream we're looking at -- of course, we're going to be getting lower temperatures downstream, but this water off the bottom or lower levels of Lake Almanor is very low in dissolved oxygen. And when it comes out of Butt Valley Powerhouse it'll be low in dissolved oxygen and actually below basin standards.

And here's a diagram of that down in Butt Valley Powerhouse. And basin standards is in the seven parts per million where this red is existing. And we're at that now. And with this Prattville Intake, this dissolved oxygen would get down to the one to two parts per million. And fish don't like that.

So we're looking at alternatives at what to do with this dissolved oxygen problem that the curtain would create.

Lastly, ask yourself: Well, it's cold water. If we're able to get cold water downstream, what will it do downstream? These profiles here show the effect of the curtain downstream in relation to water temperature. This is in a normal August year with a 50-percent exceedence. So this is just essentially a normal year during normal meteorology.

And what you see down -- this is a traverse going

about 40 miles down river, 50 miles down river. And it shows you each river of existing -- which is the red line -- and some of these proposals that we're looking at, these lower lines here.

So take, for example, down at Rock Creek-Cresta. Do you remember this 20 degrees Centigrade as our goal and objective. Currently in August of a normal year, we're exceeding 20 degrees down there almost all the time.

Now this curtain or curtain alternatives will get us below that. So that's what this chart shows here. This is the Cresta reach and down on the Poe reach. Next slide, Scott.

This is an extreme August, 25-percent exceedence. So this is a drier year and warmer meteorology. And you see here existing -- we're up to 22 degrees here. And the curtain will get us down to about 21 degrees, 20 degrees, in that range.

So these are the end products of some of the studies that we've been currently undergoing and discussing with our Collaborative Group.

The next step, we're going to continue with our 2105 Collaborative Group, as many members are here tonight. We're working with our Rock Creek-Cresta Ecological Resource Committee. That's a part of the Rock Creek-Cresta license. And, lastly, we're working with the Poe Relicensing

Collaborative Group in evaluating the feasibility of all alternatives to achieving colder water on the North Fork of the Feather River.

That's the end of my presentation, John. And I wanted to just let you know that. PG&E is currently preparing written comments that are due at the end of this month on the Draft EIS, and we'll be providing those to you. In those we're also going to include -- you asked in the Draft here for the 2002 and 2003 water-quality sampling data. We have that, and we'll be providing that to you.

You also asked for the fish-tissue analysis, and we'll be having that in our comments.

And, thirdly, we have some profiles of water-quality trends in Lake Almanor, which we'll be providing you also. So, thank you.

MR. MUDRE: Great. This is John Mudre again. Thank you, Tom. I've got -- don't run away -- just a couple of questions for you.

I mean what you showed this evening's focus mainly on Lake Almanor, but I guess it's my understanding that you're also looking at some other measures that could provide or help provide colder water downstream that may not involve Lake Almanor. Could you just briefly say a few words about those?

MR. JEREB: Yes. We're looking at other

alternatives, nonLake Almanor alternatives, to try and resolve our cold-water issues. We have six that we're looking at. And they include well water, digging wells and using well water to cool the river water.

We're looking at cooling, mechanically cooling the water using cooling towers. We're looking at piping of water out of the deep end of Lake Oroville. We're looking at vegetation and management for shading purposes. We're looking at piping of water out of Yellow Creek into the Feather River, bypassing Rock Creek Reservoir. And, lastly, we're looking at large reservoirs, building large reservoirs, to try and create some additional water, colder water, to use for cooling purposes.

So those six alternatives we're evaluating; we're discussing them with our Collaborative Group and trying to move forward with those as alternatives to the Prattville Intake curtain.

MR. MUDRE: Okay. Thank you for that. And now I have a hard question for you. And it's hard because you are in a collaborative process and there's, you know, lots of good ideas that go around and they need to be studied, but do you have any feel for when you may be at the point where you've got a decision and you're thinking, well, even now I think, you know, this looks like what we ought to propose to FERC and do that or, alternatively, you conclude that none

of these measures are really going to meet the objective or, for some reason, they're not feasible.

I'm just trying to get some feel, if it's possible, for when you guys may be wrapping up this process.

MR. JEREB: Well, that's a very good question. When? And I can tell you what my thinking of this is. We have an upcoming meeting November 4th where we're going to continue to look at mixes of these alternatives. And so I would -- my crystal ball says it would take us one to two months to try and come to some kind of conclusion regarding these alternatives.

We're also looking at and evaluating with the Lake Almanor alternative is a high Seneca flow release, large flows out of the Canyon Dam, which we can get cold water and looking at that, blending it with the Caribou flows. It does bypass Butt Valley and Caribou Powerhouses.

But we're experiencing there the same situation that we would experience with the curtain. It would be mining cold water out of the lake. We can do it rather effectively with that. And so it would probably have the same impacts on the lake and the lake ecology as the curtain would. So that's another alternative that we're trying to evaluate.

MR. MUDRE: Tom, this is John Mudre again.

That brings up one other question for me. I know

you've done your temperature modeling, and a lot of things like that. Have you given any consideration or evaluated what the effects are on the ecology of Lake Almanor. And maybe you could just tell us what you've done along those lines.

MR. JEREB: John, the answer to that is yes, we have the consultants, Tom Payne and Associates, which is a California-based aquatic biology firm looking at this. We've also had Jones and Stokes looking at this. We have two reports that are out that discuss the ecology impacts in Lake Almanor.

Dr. Tu here, Scott Tu, -- Scott, would you stand up?

DR. TU: (Standing up in front row.)

MR. JEREB: Dr. Tu is PG&E's chief scientist in the water quality. And he's in charge of the water quality monitoring program and modeling program at PG&E. And so he's with me tonight and could answer any questions also.

MR. MUDRE: And one last question. Maybe you recall, Tom, but I'm assuming that your Collaborative Group is going to be looking at the results of all these studies, both whether you can get the water downstream and you can get cold water out of Lake Almanor, is it still cold downstream? You know, what are the biological impacts of doing this, and are you going to consider all that

information in coming up with your decision?

MR. JEREB: Yes. The answer to that is yes. All that information is coming forward in the forms of reports. And our Collaborative Group is under discussions with this information. And a key member of that, of course, is the State Water Resources Control Board. And they are there and participating actively in this process.

MR. MUDRE: Great. Very well. Thank you very much, Tom.

Okay. I've got the list here of people that want to speak? Yes, okay. Thank you for being --

MR. WILLHOIT: Could I ask a question about the process before we leave that?

MR. MUDRE: Thank you for being patient.

MR. WILLHOIT: My name is Mike Willhoit. I'm a member of the Plumas County 2105 Committee.

And specifically, John, I'd like to -- or whoever could answer this -- ask about the process that you'll follow from this point with the Fish and Wildlife Service. In the EIS on page 361, and you refer to, in a general way, you said, "We do not adopt Interior's recommendation to develop a water temperature management plan, fund and construct a modified Prattville intake, and fund other structure(s) to satisfy appropriate water temperature criteria..."

Now I was curious when I read that, so I went online and I found their 10(j) recommendations on page 20, 21. I found that they did recommend that a thermal curtain be put in and also found that they did say that the Rock Creek-Cresta Settlement and license require -- they agreed to the curtain, which I found to be a bit disingenuous.

Now my question is: You said, and I understand that 10(j) conditions are just that, and they have to be included in the license. And that's a simplification, probably. But my question has to do with where you go from here in dealing with that specific issue and is the public precluded from that? Will there be no hearings? Are we shut out, as you go through that?

MR. MUDRE: I'll try that one. Thank you.

The 10(j) -- well, what we did -- and the part that you read in the Draft EIS was that we made a preliminary determination that that particular 10(j) recommendation of theirs was -- basically there wasn't evidence to support the need for it at this point, the substantial evidence standard.

But the important point of it, the 10(j) recommendation, is that they are not mandatory conditions. The Commission has to give them due deference, but if we find, if the Commission makes a determination that -- a recommendation that's inconsistent with the Federal Power

Act or any other applicable law that we do not have to include those in the license.

So what we do at this point is we sent the letter to the Fish and Wildlife, Interior, and basically said, well, okay, you know, here are the recommendations you gave us and we adopted these. We've made preliminary determinations that these may be inconsistent with the Federal Power Act or some other law and with the implication being that, you know, we may not include those in the license.

So what we try to do now is talk to them and see if, well, maybe there is something else that can be done to achieve the same goals but that would be consistent with the Federal Power Act, or maybe they can show us, you know, that it's not inconsistent with the Federal Power Act.

So that part is basically a dialogue between us and them, although it is done on the record and so people can see these letters. And in some cases, if we can't resolve the issue right away with a letter, sometimes we'll hold a 10(j) meeting. Those are open to the public. So you're not excluded from that process.

Again, the good news, I guess, from your standpoint is that, again, these are not strictly mandatory conditions.

Okay. I've got the sign-in list here. It looks

like about, maybe, 12 or 13 people indicated --

MR. DECOTO: Would you add another? I did not have an opportunity to sign it.

MR. MUDRE: Okay.

MS. HAFEN: Yes, I would want to, too.

MR. MUDRE: I can understand that. We have two things going here. We do want to get comments on the Draft EIS, things that people think we did right; things that we did wrong; things that we overlooked. So we're interested in hearing specific comments on that.

I know there's a lot of people here that want to give us their opinion on the thermal curtain. And based on the amount of time we have left and the people who want to speak, we don't mind hearing from you tonight on that. I do want people to understand, though, that from our standpoint these comments are, in a way, premature because there is no proposal in front of the Commission to do anything with this. But at the same time if I lived here, I'd probably be in one of those seats, too, so...

(Laughter.)

MR. MUDRE: Normally what we do is if there are any elected officials or representatives of supervisors, types of people, we'll let them speak first. And then if there's someone -- let's try this. If there's someone that just wants to make some comments on the Draft EIS and is not

particularly interested in hearing about the thermal curtain, we could let them give us their comments first and then they can leave. And we can then talk at length about the thermal curtain, if that's what people want to do.

So I think first, though, maybe we'll have the supervisor speak. And then if there's someone that just wants to talk about the nonthermal-curtain parts of the Draft EIS, let them talk, and then we'll hear everyone else who wants to talk.

MR. DENNISON: I will be brief. Thank you, John. I'm William N. Dennison, D-e-n-n-i-s-o-n, Plumas County Supervisor District 3 and also the Chairman of the 2105 Committee that's been working collaboratively with what's known as the 2105 Licensing Group, to keep them separate.

And during these past two years, I'm pleased to say that we have worked diligently to develop some very positive things together. And those have been put in the Settlement Agreement, as you noted. And I appreciate the fact that you've accepted most of them in your Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

With hours of committee work, we've been able to surmount great obstacles. We did it in a little different way. We didn't say: I want my way. We said: Can we live with it? And that really went a long way with the whole group. We even agreed with PG&E a couple times.

(Laughter.)

MR. DENNISON: The Lake Almanor 2105 Committee has not worked in a vacuum. These folks, we tried to keep them up to date as well as constituents. It's been somewhat difficult at times when we hold the meetings in Chico, but we've had the last two of them up here.

You'll find that the community and the Board of Supervisors takes little issue with most of what is found in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. That's for the most part, other than the thermal curtain. You will find that the sequence of speakers will primarily be addressing only those areas where we either find ourselves in disagreement such as a thermal curtain within the EIS, or believe that something's misunderstood, or that there's a missing element.

There will be some tonight who will want to reference the DEIS in regard to the thermal curtain because it is referenced over a dozen times. And it's up there in front. Even though the curtains are not a specific proposal in the Draft EIS, we will appreciate your consideration of these statements that are made by these folks tonight because, first, the Prattville Intake modification was established as a primary source for water-temperature reduction in the Rock Creek-Cresta license, as you've noted, and whose construction is going to be determined in part on

the Ecological Resource Committee, which kind of puts these folks out of the loop here for a while until it gets into CEQA analysis.

Second, the thermal curtains have been the only temperature-reduction proposal that's really been promulgated to this point. Yes, we've talked about some others, but that's been out in front.

And, third, the reason these folks are interested in it is because the ratepayers are going to be the one to pay for this $53-million-and-rising installation. So I hope you will listen to these folks and understand that some of it is out of frustration, but most of it is out of the fact that they really are concerned about the lake.

Now this leads every thinking person who has seen all this in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement to believe that since FERC has had this on their radarscope since 1996 -- you recall that was when it's first noted, and it was turned down, but it keeps coming up -- there's really many people who believe that it's being considered very seriously, even today.

I'm certain you'll find no disagreement from those here today and certainly not from the Board of Supervisors that the issuance of a new of a new license is the opportunity to review, the opportunity for enhancement of our downriver fisheries and water quality. This is found

vividly in the Settlement Agreement.

However, we're here to say there must be a balance in how those positive attributes are developed and most certainly cannot be to the detriment of the prime fisheries of Lake Almanor and Butt Reservoir.

As an example, that concern I relate to it on page 323, line 11. This notes the need for various adaptive management plans and monitoring plans that will be established, and I quote, "...to evaluate salmonid and wakasagi populations..." after the approval and construction of the Prattville Intake modification.

Now our problem with that approach is after the fact. You know, we're looking for sound science that will tell us we don't have to worry about having to tear this out because we found later on, with monitoring, that things went wrong.

Plumas is concerned that the delay of the relicensing is going to cause a loss of positive aspects that we've negotiated in the Settlement Agreement, too. And for that reason it's our intention, working through the licensing group, to promote the opportunity to finalize the license without the thermal curtain and with some assurances that other alternatives will provide a resolution to the water-temperature issue.

We say it's effective, but we're seeing a lot of

data that says, no, it's not going to work. And we want to make sure that you understand that it's what we're seeing now in these studies that are coming out from PG&E and practical lake knowledge, which you'll be hearing from some people here, Almanor Fishing Group, that know the lake.

That has led to the resolution that's been passed by Plumas County Board of Supervisors that I'm providing you tonight. This states that we will not accept the thermal curtain, that we will enlist state and federal elected and appointed officials to assure that no more money is wasted on this study and on the assumed installation of any thermal curtain in either Lake Almanor or Butt Reservoir.

Now this may seem a little bit strong and maybe even a little arrogant, but that is our resolve, the Board of Supervisors. So we just wanted you to know that as we're going into that.

On the other hand, I think it's important for you to know that Plumas County will continue to work with the Collaborative Group. We think that's important. We've come a long way; we want to continue with it to find alternative solutions to any realistic water-temperature issue. We believe that there are alternatives that can help the fish in the lower Feather River and eliminate any damage to our lakes and upper streams.

One that Mr. Jereb forgot to mention was

reoperation of the Caribou 1 and 2. We will also be studying that.

So I want to thank you for permitting us to provide our responses. I'd hope you'd be able to take them in order. Maybe that won't fit your schedule, but I do have a list of people that would like to go on in this panel sequence, if we could. Thank you.

MR. MUDRE: All right. Thank you, Bill.

I don't have any problem with the sequence that you'd like to see. My point was, though, that -- I mean if there is someone here that just wants to make some comments on the DEIS and is not interested in the thermal-curtain issue, we'll let them have their say, and they can go on their way. And if there isn't, then we'll just go right to the sequence that Bill's laying out.

(Comments made by the audience out of range of the microphone.)

MR. MUDRE: Okay. We do have the court reporter, and if you don't have this mic, she's not going to hear what you're saying. So let me let this gentleman here speak. And then I think we'll probably going to turn it over to Bill's order then.

MS. HAFEN: Excuse me. I did want to make a comment on the EIS.

MR. MUDRE: Okay.

THE REPORTER: Please come to a microphone.

MS. HAFEN: I didn't get on the sign-up sheet.

MR. MUDRE: Okay. What we'll do, we'll do this gentleman here, this lady here, and then -- there's another one?

You, too?

MR. KELLY: I wanted to ask a question about something you said in your --

MR. MUDRE: You have to come up then. It's a little harder when we just have the one mic here. And I appreciate your bearing with us.

MR. KELLY: My name is Phil Kelly. In your introductory remarks I believe you said something like there may be some "surprises along the way."

I wonder if any were forthcoming, that if you could review them for us as they presented themselves?

(Laughter.)

MR. MUDRE: Oh, well, I just did that so no one would leave.

(Laughter.)

MR. MUDRE: Okay. So we'll turn to this gentleman for the first comments.

MR. DECOTO: Good evening. Mr. Chairman, I thank you for the opportunity to speak here tonight.

THE REPORTER: Your name, please.

MR. DECOTO: My name is Ron Decoto. That's spelled D-e-c-o-t-o.

THE REPORTER: Thank you.

MR. DECOTO: I'm here as a retired California Department of Fish and Game, District Fisheries Biologist for Plumas County with over 32 years of experience. Twenty-five years of this experience was spent working on Lake Almanor and Butt Valley Reservoirs. I was also a District Biologist since 1987 for all the waters in Plumas County.

Tonight I just would like to address my comments in response to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. I'm in agreement with many of your statements in this document, and I'll attempt to point out the areas that we agree with. It's kind of the opposite of the way most people probably will present this tonight, but due to limited time, and so forth, I'd like to stay on these points.

Fish and Game studies that -- before I go into the actual comments on the report, I'd like to make this one statement.

Fish and Game studies at Lake Almanor and Butt Valley Reservoir over the past 35 years have demonstrated the importance of the lake's thermal structure for salmonids' -- that's trout and salmon -- survival.

Springtime thermal conditions allow the salmonids to actively roam the reservoir with satisfactory water conditions, dissolved oxygen, and food, so they're quite happy during the springtime. This is the time that they put on the most growth because of the water conditions and everything is conducive for that.

But then comes the warm water in June, July, and August, the time when the proposed thermal curtain would be taking approximately 50 percent of the cold water from the deep layers called the hydrotherm layer. The salmonids then begin to concentrate in distinct areas in the lake, which I call "thermal refuges."

These areas consist of inflows of cold-oxygenated water in the springs and the mouths of the tributary streams. The ill effects of this crowding of large numbers of fish is increased stress into competition for these areas, which will cause disease, competition for food, and even starvation.

As a biologist, I've tried to establish fish-stocking rates for Lake Almanor based a lot upon the size of these thermal refuges. Observed mortalities of adult fish, such as occurred in Big Springs, is a signal that they have exceeded the lake's summer-carrying capacity in these areas.

So I say this in that these areas are so critical

in the summertime that a very slight change in condition, either in temperature, or oxygen, food supply, numbers of fish, or whatever, could have a significant impact upon the lake.

Now I'd to give you some of these statements in your document that we are in agreement with. On page 77 you say, and I quote: "The combination of alteration of [the] thermal and" dissolved oxygen "conditions [at] Lake Almanor would substantially shift the ability of the reservoir to support its existing coldwater and warmwater fisheries."

I agree with you a hundred percent.

On the same page, you say, "Using the coldwater supply in Lake Almanor and/or shifting operations of...Caribou developments could also affect the thermal regime and DO levels in Butt Valley reservoir and could" -- let me stress -- "adversely affect the existing trophy rainbow trout and brown trout" fisheries "in this reservoir."

Again, I agree with you.

On page 78, you say, "Modifications and implementation of the Prattville intake and/or implementation of other water temperature control measures is expected to" -- let me stress -- "substantially alter the thermal and DO regimes in Lake Almanor..."

Studies have already confirmed that the releasing

of stagnant cold water devoid of oxygen into Butt Valley Reservoir would have a significant impact on this trophy fishery.

Due to time -- I don't know how much time we have. Somebody said I have three minutes, so I have my talk pretty much around that area. If I've got more time, I can...

MR. MUDRE: Well, let's let everyone have their say first. And then maybe you could, you know, later on come back.

MR. DECOTO: Okay. I'd just like to summarize in case I don't have a chance to close.

I am not willing to take a chance based on modeling studies done in a swimming pool --

(Laughter.)

MR. DECOTO: -- that the delicate ecological balance in Lake Almanor and Butt Valley will not be, quote, adversely impacted with a thermal curtain. And I therefore ask you to abandon any further consideration of the thermal curtain. Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. MUDRE: Thank you, Ron.

This gentleman here, and then the lady back here. And then Bill's group.

MR. GARRIDO: Good evening. My name is Paul

Garrido, G-a-r-r-i-d-o.

I'm here representing the Almanor Fishing Association and its 300 members. I would like to share our concern regarding the proposed thermal curtain in Lake Almanor and Butt Valley Reservoir. This project is certain to have a negative environmental impact on the health of Lake Almanor and cause serious damage to Butt Valley Reservoir and their respective fisheries.

The proposal to remove 50 percent of the cold water from Lake Almanor to decrease the temperature a few degrees to enhance the fishery between Belden and Rock Creek-Cresta is highly unlikely when you consider the distance the water must travel through Butt Valley Reservoir, PG&E -- I'm sorry -- Butt Valley Reservoirs, PG&E forebays and powerhouses.

We believe this approach to correcting the current problem in the North Fork of the Feather River should be further explored by PG&E before PG&E spends millions of dollars on the installation of a thermal curtain on these pristine lakes.

This area of the North Fork of the Feather River would best be served by PG&E exploring other known methods of cooling the waters in the river. The Department of Fish and Game and PG&E could also enhance the river fisheries by providing new spawning beds, fish ladders, additional fish

plants, and enforcement of current fishing regulations.

The Almanor Fishing Association has 15 years of experience on the effects of warm water on the 50,000 Eagle Lake trout raised annually in ten cages at the Hamilton Branch.

I need water.

MR. SPEAKER: Cold?

(Laughter.)

MR. GARRIDO: Yes.

These trout are raised annually in ten cages at the Hamilton Branch. In the spring, as the water warms to 55 degrees, the fish begin to show signs of stress. At 58 and 59 degrees, we start seeing warm-water viruses on their tails and bodies. We then start releasing the Eagle Lake trout so they may find cooler water. We believe this stressing of warm-water virus on the fishery could happen in the fairly-shallow west shore of Lake Almanor, whose average depth is less than 25 feet.

If 50 percent of the cold water is removed in early summer, the west shore of Lake Almanor would quickly warm, driving the fish into deeper, colder spring areas on each side of the lake, thus eliminating the enormous food chain of the west shore. Also greatly affected would be the many different insect hatches, including the very popular Hex Hatch.

Much has been said and written about this project, but other than the model developed at the University of Iowa, using a small-scale replica of Lake Almanor, no other information about the effects of cold-water removal and its environmental effect on a shallow lake such as Almanor is known.

At Butt Valley Reservoir not only is the fishery and the food chain threatened, but no one knows what the effects of the mass of cold water flowing through the reservoir will be on the insects hatches' fishery and the environment of that lake.

And in closing, I say due to the increase in the local population, tourism, fishing, boating pressure on these lakes, we should be thinking about improving the environment of Lake Almanor instead of damaging it. Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. MUDRE: Thank you very much.

This lady right here.

MS. HAFEN: I am Jeannine Hafen, H-a-f-e-n, with Roundhouse Council. That's a Native American Family Resource Center and Education Center in Greenville. And my comments on the Draft EIS have to do with the cultural properties, traditional cultural properties.

There are a long list of PCPs that were evaluated

as no longer important and would need only mitigation. And I don't know where that evaluation came from, but I know we have some objections to that. And that because some of them have been destroyed doesn't mean that they still don't have some importance to the local community. I know that they're underwater; they don't have access any more, but there are some that still -- the possibility that there's access.

And we'd really like to see some mitigation that requires PG&E to allow access to certain sites. It doesn't leave it -- they can consider or we'd recommend. So that's -- I'll keep those comments short, but that's basically it.

And also because so much time has been given to the Prattville Intake there are ten Maidu groups that have come together and done a resolution opposing it, so I'd like to submit that for the record. I have six copies.

MR. MUDRE: Great.

MS. HAFEN: Will that work? Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. MUDRE: Thank you very much.

If you do have, and I know you do, concerns about specific sites, and things like that, it may be -- I can suggest you send in more detailed written comments. And that way we can know, in particular, which sites you do have concerns with, because there is a long list of them. And that would help us sort through and get to your concerns

better.

Okay. Curtain time.

(Laughter and comments off the record regarding room temperature.)

MR. MUDRE: Bill, excuse me. Are the people that you are calling, the names that are on this list?

MR. DENNISON: Yes. The next one is Russ Lesko.

MR. LESKO: Good evening. My name is Russ Lesko, and I'm a recently-retired natural resource professional. I last served as the Chief of Natural Resources at Lassen Volcanic National Park. And over my career I have spent some time, I had the dubious honor of spending some time in meetings like you folks are. And I realize that you folks on the stage do not wear black hats, that the work you do is difficult, and I applaud your service. That doesn't mean I agree with everything that's in the EIS. And I also thank you for informing me -- I am a member of Bill's group, and I didn't know the name of that before.

(Laughter.)

MR. LESKO: My focus tonight will be on the visual impacts associated with the Draft EIS. And first I want to commend the Commission for its sensitivity with respect to visual aesthetics. And I quote from the Draft EIS:

"A coordinated approach to address visual effects

of the existing facilities and proposed new facilities would help to protect aesthetic resources within the project area and help ensure that project facilities would be consistent with the applicable LRMP," which I assume is long-range management plan. I'm not sure.

But I simply want to bring to your attention to the proposed project. One is the painting of the metal siding and roof of the hoist house on the Prattville Intake, the structure a dark green color, and the planting of trees to reduce the visual domination of PG&E-operated maintenance buildings located at the Prattville Intake.

I respectfully suggest to the Commission that these projects, while beneficial, pale in scope to the visual blight of the Prattville Intake modification, otherwise know as the thermal curtain.

I call your attention first to this picture which is -- there it is right there -- of the Whiskeytown thermal curtain, which I will submit to you. These metal floats, similar in size to large propane tanks, would, in the case of Lake Almanor, extend some 2600 feet from the Prattville Intake.

The perimeter of the float system that would be required is depicted in this aerial photograph of the boat demonstration that took place a few weeks earlier, in which about 70 boats participated.

I can't help but wonder how many people, whether they're on the lake or on the shore, would see past this revolting, floating boom structure and appreciate the dark-green intake (laughter) and the newly-planted seedlings.

(Laughter.)

MR. LESKO: And I would be remiss not to mention this eyesore will be placed in front of what is designated in the Project 2105 Settlement Agreement as "Marvin Alexander Beach."

Marvin is a beloved and respected man who spent 20 years of his life defending Lake Almanor water levels, water quality, and lake aesthetics. Marvin passed away last month, but not before admonishing PG&E, the State Water Resources Control Board, and other involved agencies that support for a thermal curtain would be political suicide.

Lastly, I want to point out that the Lake Almanor thermal curtain is only one of three curtains proposed in a misguided attempt to lower the temperature in a short reach of the Upper North Fork of the Feather River one degree Celsius.

This scheme would require two additional curtains of unknown size in Butt Lake Reservoir. The estimated cost of this system is now over $53 million, as we've heard, and it has increased tenfold from a few years ago. Costs would

be borne by PG&E ratepayers.

A 1999 cost benefit analysis commissioned by PG&E stated, and I quote, "The Temperature Modification proposal does not come close to justifying its cost, as calculated by FERC methods. At the time of this writing, PG&E's estimated capital costs for the Prattville Intake modification were $5 million."

In summary, the Prattville Intake modification or thermal curtain is an egregious concept that would mar the existing beautiful view sheds of Lake Almanor and Butt Valley Reservoir, as well as cause substantial ecological damage to these treasured lakes.

I respectfully suggest the Commission, PG&E, and State Water Resources Control Board take a step back, give other alternatives for cooling downstream waters a fair assessment, and develop a comprehensive plan based on current science for management of PG&E facilities in the Lake Almanor Basin.

I thank the Commission for this opportunity to express my concerns.

(Applause.)

MR. MUDRE: Thank you very much.

MR. DE JONG: Good evening. I'm John De Jong, local Realtor up here. My name is spelled D-e J-o-n-g.

And I just want to address shortly the concerns I

have for the economic impact that it's going to have on our people here.

In the past 15 years we have been changing from a timber industry to a recreational industry. The timber industry is down something probably 60 to 70 percent of where it was. And I think everybody here knows that.

The local residents today are in a service industry with seasonal recreational activities. Our seasonal activities go for about 12 weeks in the summertime. We depend on the fishermen and the quality of the water and the lake quality for two months on each side of that 12 weeks. And if we take that away from them, the businesses can't survive on 12 weeks' worth of business. They just won't survive.

Some of them are struggling now. Our restaurants are usually in and out. Some of the other smaller businesses go in and out on a regular basis.

The people that came here and are buying property up here, I would say 90 percent of them come up here with the lake in mind, not necessarily the golf, the trees, the other parts of the environment. It's the lake that brings them here.

The fishing in Lake Almanor extends, like I said, two months on each side. The draw of Lake Almanor has always been a constant for as long as I've been coming up

here. I started in '72, and I moved up here 15 years ago. And it's always been the one thing that is constant. The lumber is going down. A lot of other things are going down. Because of the way the school systems work today, the season is getting shorter every year, it seems like. And it's tough for the economic industry to keep going.

To endanger the economy of the whole Lake Almanor Basin for unproven benefits for an unknown few seems like a no-brainer to me. I mean there isn't a whole lot 40 miles downstream. I know that that's required by PG&E, by some licensing that they did downstream years back, but I think that has to be looked at also.

To hold up the license process for this very questionable project and to hold up some of the major improvements of both Lake Almanor recreational access areas which were being improved by PG&E that could be done right away seems incredible. I mean these guys worked for two years to try to get this thing put together. They've got some very good ideas. And PG&E has agreed with them to go ahead with these projects if they get licensed. If this license is held up, nothing gets done. Everything goes on hold, and everybody stands still until it happens. It'll improve the economy up here by the work that's done, because there's projects all the way around the lake that most people don't even know that are going on or that will go on

once this thing goes through.

Right now there is little or no economy 40 miles down the river. So what are we improving? Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. MUDRE: Thank you.

MR. ORANGE: Good evening. Thank you for the opportunity to speak with you this evening. My name is Bob Orange, and I am a Regional Director and state vice president for the California Fish and Game Wardens Association, whom I am representing here tonight.

This organization has proudly represented California Game Wardens for nearly 80 years. I have been a Warden for 26 years. My patrol district is right here in Plumas County. My father has been a retired Warden with 36 years of state service.

A historical fact for your reference that you or may not know, Game Wardens are fully sworn state peace officers and have been protecting California's resources and enforcing state laws since 1870. That's 59 years before the California Highway Patrol was even created.

Game Wardens are also unique because we do not only enforce game law, we also review and assist in the preparation of complex environmental documents, which brings me to the purpose of my speaking to you here today.

There are currently two Wardens working in Plumas

County. One on the east side of the County in the Portola area, and I have the west side of the County which encompasses all of the Project 2105 area.

As part of my concern for the resources of my patrol area, I have reviewed much of the documentation regarding the thermal curtain and all of the alternatives presented so far.

However, it is my opinion that there are several more practical and effective alternatives that have been omitted from this plan that deserve utmost serious consideration.

The purpose of the cold-water curtain is to lower the water temperature of the Feather downstream. The end-desired product is to improve the fisheries. Correct?

There are other ways to improve the fisheries in the same section without the thermal curtain. As a direct result of the FERC 2105 relicensing process, there has been very restrictive fishing rules placed on the waters of this system in order to improve the fisheries. These are laws that I must enforce every day, so I have firsthand knowledge of the impacts.

Let me explain some of the laws I'm talking about. Hang on. For 26 miles of the river from Belden to Pulga, the regulations are zero limit, artificial lures, barbless hooks, with a season from the last Saturday in

April to only November 15th. In other words, you must catch and release all your fish back into state waters.

However, in the three power dam forebays in this geographical section of river: Cresta, Poe, Rock Creek, you can use bait, barbed hooks, keep a five-fish limit and fish year round.

In all the tributaries that empty into this section, zero fish-limit zone, you may keep five fish, and use bait.

At the next power dam above this section, Caribou Forebay, the trout limit is now two. And the season is again the last Saturday in April to November 15th.

Now let's move farther up to Butt Lake. The limit at Butt Lake is two fish. The season is year round, save for the area around Butt Lake Powerhouse where the season is the Saturday preceding Memorial Day to February 28th. Now the tributaries of Butt Lake have a different season than the other reservoirs downstream. These tribs don't open until Memorial weekend.

Now finally we're here at Lake Almanor. The fishing season there is year round with a five-fish trout limit. Tributaries to Almanor do not open to fishing until Memorial weekend also.

Does this sound confusing to you? You bet. You bet it is. It's confusing for me as an enforcing officer

and for the sportsmen and fishermen that fish these waters.

These regulations are a result of part of the FERC 2105 relicensing.

Poaching problems abound. Can the laws be effectively enforced with the personnel we have? Frankly, the answer is no. There's one Warden statewide for every 180,000 people in this state. That's pretty low.

Every spring and fall, trout spawn in the tributaries up and down the river and the lake system encompassed by Project 2105. They become blocked at barriers where they are highly susceptible of being snagged and netted out. One officer cannot patrol hundreds of miles of streams.

At the diversion dam fish ladder just a couple miles upstream from here, poachers have been caught at three o'clock in the morning snagging spawning fish. A very simple solution to improve the fisheries here is to increase enforcement of the laws already on the books. By doing this literally thousands of trout will be able to successfully spawn, creating larger numbers of fish.

You may think that just checking fishermen would be all we do. It is not. We also enforce fish passage laws. We need to check the streams to ensure fish passage by artificial barriers. On the right here we have on the PowerPoint a water-gauging station on Butt Creek just above

Butt Lake. These are photos of fish trying to jump over it. My observations are that out of approximately 50 attempts, only one leap is successful. These fish run up to, probably, around seven pounds, eight pounds.

These large trout are literally beating themselves to death by trying to migrate upstream over this barrier. Modify this barrier to incorporate a fish ladder and you will add dozens of miles of prime spawning stream for the wild trout fishery of Butt Lake.

This, again, is a poaching problem because these fish are stopped at the barrier and are then easily caught by unethhical anglers. Problems similar to this obstruction abound throughout the stream system in this area. Okay, next picture.

Okay. It's another shot of the same location. Let's go ahead and go to the next one.

Okay. Here is a photo of a trash rack down the canyon near Rogers Flat. What happens here, there's lots of these sorts of barriers. CalTrans and the railroad, they keep the trash from blocking-up the culverts, from going underneath the facilities. Wardens are responsible for making sure that these things are cleaned out in order to allow upstream fish migration from the spawning trout out of the main river system. We can't get around to inspect these all the time. Okay, go, Next picture. Okay.

Here is a photo of a water crossing under a railroad down the canyon. Modifications need to be made to ensure spawning out of the main river system. This can be made at a number of locations. All would greatly improve the existing fisheries in the Feather River, which is the original intent of the cold-water proposal. Put a modification in there; put a fish ladder in there, we can open up more spawning stream.

Another critical item that has been completely neglected throughout this whole process: One of security for the powerplants, dams, transmission lines, and energy infrastructure licensed by this project. Homeland Security issues cannot be forgotten here. Chances are that in this great state if there is a terrorist event against these facilities, it will be the Podunk Game Warden out there working who will discover it and be involved.

Wherever you have a lake or powerhouse, you have a Game Warden. That's us watching it when we have the time. This is often in a surveillance mode from cover, watching for overlimits, snagging, litter, vandalism, et cetera.

Wardens know what is going on from repeated visits on foot, not driving by in a car going 60 miles an hour. We don't whiz over the bridges in the canyon. We get out and check out what is underneath them. Transmission line corridors have quail or rabbit hunters. Who patrols

them on a regular basis? Wardens do.

In summary, we can do the following items, which would have an immediate impact of improving the fisheries within the FERC 2105 Project. In my opinion, they would improve the fisheries more than the installation of the thermal curtain.

A precedent has been set by the State of California already. In the Bay-Delta there are large pumping plants at Tracy which pump water from the Central Valley Project Aqueduct. As a result of the huge pumps at Tracy, millions of small fish are killed each year.

As mitigation by the State Department of Water Resources, seven Game Warden positions are funded by the California Department of Water Resources to prevent overfishing, snagging, pollution, gill netting, et cetera. By enforcing fish regulations, fishery resources are protected and enhanced.

I propose that PG&E fund one Game Warden position full time in Plumas County for the life of this agreement. The primary focus of this position would be enforcement of the fishing regulations encompassed by the waters of FERC 2105.

This Warden would also enhance security against possible terrorist activity of any type. The position would serve as a public relations contact for the recreational

users of this project. This would also include boat patrol of Butt and Almanor Lakes.

The purpose of the position would be to enforce, educate the public, and provide security. Right now there is very little enforcement of the fishing regulations in this area due to lack of personnel. The proposed officer would also inspect and ensure removal of screen barriers, which also prevent spawning fish migration along the North Fork of the Feather.

In addition, I propose a yearly overtime budget for the officers who work this. The costs of providing a Warden in this handout were presented to you. We don't make a whole lot of money, so you'd get a pretty good bang for your buck than the tens of millions of dollars going into the thermal curtain. And we can achieve the same purpose: That of a better fishery.

Finally, I propose a modification of the Butt Creek water-gauging station above Butt Lake to improve spawning migration. This may be easily accomplished by installing a fish ladder.

Again, I reiterate that I believe implementation of this alternative presented would result in more overall quality fisheries, experience, and enhancement than building a thermal curtain. Certainly a whole less controversy. Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. MUDRE: Thank you very much.

MR. SEANDEL: Good evening. I am going to be reading a statement by Robert Lambert who is ill and is not able to be here. My name is Aaron Seandel, S-e-a-n-d-e-l.

The comments: I would like to comment on two issues -- now reading for Robert Lambert -- raised in the DEIS. And they would be: Shoreline erosion and the proposed pulse flows below the project dams, those two issues.

On shoreline erosion: As noted by FERC on DEIS page 83, line 22: Significant shoreline erosion is occurring in several areas around the lake with seven percent of the shoreline experiencing, quote, "substantial erosion."

This is due to, one, the raising of the operating level of PG&E in 1972 and, two, wave action due to winds and the effects of boating. Erosion is caused by recreationists who drive off-road vehicles along the shoreline -- I quote from DEIS page 82, lines 8 and 9 -- of the lake.

The continuing erosion is resulting in impacts on shoreline aesthetics, aquatic resources, cultural resources, and recreation. Worst of all, continued unchecked erosion has resulted in degradation in water quality and could result in the "introduction of fecal coliform bacteria and

human pathogens from leach fields into Lake Almanor..." Again, from the DEIS page 353, lines 8 and 9.

These leach fields were constructed near the 4500-foot mark prior to when the maximum operating level was raised in 1972.

PG&E has agreed to amend its Shoreline Management Plan to include a requirement to conduct annual surveys to evaluate shoreline erosion and to implement erosion control measures to limit erosion associated with cultural resource sites, threatened endangered species' sites, and a limited number of sites. Referring to page 82 lines 22 through 28. Beyond that, PG&E has not proposed a specific plan for shoreline erosion.

Page 64, lines 2 through 7 of the DEIS describes the Clifford Deed executed by PG&E in 1957 as granting, quote, "PG&E the right to flood or erode lands owned or acquired by the Cliffords by wave action, seepage, or other actions," unquote.

FERC appears to agree with PG&E that the Clifford Deed grants PG&E the right to erode even if such erosion results in the degradation of water quality. The Clifford Deed was signed at a time when raising the operating level was not contemplated.

In addition, environmental laws have significantly changed in the past 30 years. And PG&E should

not be able to negatively affect water quality by hiding behind the Clifford Deed.

Surely, PG&E should not have an unfettered right to erode Lake Almanor shoreline through the Clifford Deed. I respectfully ask FERC to take another look at shoreline erosion and require PG&E to take positive steps to reduce and limit shoreline erosion even on lands covered by the Clifford Deed.

Now comments on the pulse flows. In the April 22nd, 2004 Settlement Agreement, the parties agreed that PG&E would release certain pulse flows below Canyon and Belden Dams during winter months of wet and normal water years.

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, which is not a party to the Settlement Agreement, has proposed similar pulse flows that are higher in flow rate and would be required not only in wet and normal years, but dry water years as well.

In its analysis of pulse flows on pages 113 through 116 FERC generally adopts the Settlement Agreement pulse flows in wet and normal water years, but does not specifically address what pulse flows are to occur, if any, during dry and critically dry water years.

Since FERC seems to adopt, referring to page 115, lines 35 and 36, the proposed pulse flows in the Settlement

Agreement, the Environmental Impact Report should clarify that no pulse flows will be required in dry and critically dry water years.

Thank you very much.

(Applause.)

MR. DYOK: Good evening. My name is Wayne Dyok, D-y-o-k. I'm with MWH Americas. We're consultants to Plumas County. My original plan was talk about two items, the Shoreline Management Plan and shoreline erosion, to follow-up with some comments on Aaron's statements, but after hearing some of the earlier comments on the water temperatures I'd like to add a third item on water temperatures as well.

First of all, we'd like to commend the Commission on your preparation of the Draft EIS and the incorporation of most of the Settlement Agreement items as, you know, Bill had stated.

In particular, I just want to reiterate the lake level aspects of the Settlement Agreement. That's very important to this community. And thank you for agreeing with us on the proposed lake levels as part of the Settlement Agreement.

With respect to the Shoreline Management Plan, first of all, we appreciate the efforts that PG&E put forth in developing a Shoreline Management Plan. We further agree

with the Commission staff's recommendation on page 20 of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for PG&E to revise the Shoreline Management Plan and then implement it.

The County had a number of concerns on the draft plan as filed with the Commission's part of the license application. Some of the specific concerns include the land classifications.

We felt that the classifications in some respects were inconsistent with the County zoning. And there were some other elements of that plan, such as the enforcement and permitting aspects of it that we felt needed to be revised.

So what happened subsequent to the filing of that plan as part of the 2105 discussion? We met with PG&E on a number of occasions. And I'm pleased to say that for the most part our concerns have been addressed by PG&E in a revised plan. And we would expect that PG&E would be filing that revised plan.

We would first, though, like PG&E to present that plan to the County residents and public and get further input from the public on that plan and possibly revise that plan further before submitting it to the Commission. But we do think that it's a great improvement over the plan that was filed as part of the license application.

Secondly, with respect to shoreline erosion, I

want to echo some of what Aaron talked about with respect to shoreline erosion. PG&E and the County have identified a number of areas where there is significant shoreline erosion around the lake.

The Clifford Deed rights shouldn't really matter when it comes to shoreline erosion if the erosion is affecting the environmental resources, such as water quality, natural resources, fisheries, cultural resources.

We're talking about property that's within the project boundary that's owned by PG&E. And it seems kind of odd to me that we should be requiring adjacent property owners to fix a problem that's on PG&E property that's affecting the resources over which the Commission has jurisdiction. So we feel it's the Commission's responsibility to require PG&E to remedy the shoreline erosion, not only on the areas that are not Clifford Deed areas, but also on Clifford Deed areas.

I appreciate very much what you said on page 20 of the Executive Summary that PG&E is required to provide site-specific plans to control erosion for new recreation facilities that are going to be constructed. And I would suggest that the County looks forward to working with PG&E on the other areas of shoreline erosion to develop site-specific erosion plans for those areas as well.

Now I want to, based on what was said earlier

today, talk a little bit the water-temperature issue. As the FERC staff presented earlier, you determined that the information was complete and that you were ready for conducting an environmental analysis of the project.

So that suggests that you have all the information to assess water temperatures, because that's part of the application information that was filed and recognizing that there's additional information that has been provided and probably will be forthcoming in the very near future.

As part of staff's recommended alternative, it would seem to me that there's an opportunity here for the Commission to really take a leadership role in the Final Environmental Impact Statement that's going to be produced in March of next year. And that is to recommend as part of your proposed alternative, that there be no curtain.

In that case I think you'll be setting the tone for the state process by conducting your independent analysis that will conclude on the basis of the information that you're hearing tonight from the many people that are presenting, as well as the additional information that PG&E is going to be providing you in, hopefully, the very near future.

I did want to conclude by responding to one of Tom's comments that he made earlier that even though there's

going to be a lot more variability in the water temperatures in Lake Almanor taking more of that cold water away that was in the natural range of variability and, therefore, the effects would be insignificant, the analogy that I would like to use, Tom, is that of a boxer.

And a boxer that fights one or two times can probably survive and live to a ripe old age. A boxer that fights every day or every month or for several months, ofttimes sustains permanent damage. And I would think that the analogy would be very applicable for these same fish in this lake.

Thank you very much.

(Applause.)

MR. KNUTSEN: My name is Dale Knutsen. I'm a resident of the west shore area of Lake Almanor. And after reviewing the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, I'd like to offer a comment on a water-temperature item found in Section 3.3.2.2. And quoting from page 108, the fourth paragraph, "With a modified Prattville Intake configuration, the water temperature in the Belden reach would be decreased up to four degrees Celsius for the months of June through August and remain unchanged in September" -- and I would like to emphasize the last phrase -- "keeping the water temperature below 20 degrees Celsius for all months," end quote. I believe this statement may be in error, probably

based on very preliminary analyses from PG&E which have subsequently been greatly expanded.

My understanding of the more recent studies is that, even with a modified Prattville Intake, the Belden reach water temperatures during July and August can be expected to be in excess of 20 degrees during some climatic and hydrographic conditions, specifically during dry and critically dry water years, which statistically we seem to have a lot of.

I would, therefore, ask FERC to request from PG&E the full spectrum of revised studies so that the Final Environmental Impact Statement can reflect the updated information.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

MS. SUTTON: Good evening. My name is Sue Sutton. I'm with Family Water Alliance. I also happen to be a part-time resident here in the Valley as well as here in the Chester area.

I have a couple comments. I think the one thing that concerns me most is the fact that, while PG&E has not put on the table the fact that they are considering seriously a temperature curtain, it has been mentioned 12 times. And in my experience in the past when items of this nature are brought forth and mentioned so many times, so

numerously, they are, indeed, on the table.

Secondly, I believe that the documentation says we need to look at reasonable -- PG&E has to have a reasonableness about determining the attempt of creating the temperature measures. I believe that what has been presented tonight does not show that sense of reasonableness. And I would ask the Commission to consider and define what "reasonable" really, indeed, means.

There's a whole lot of other alternatives that I did not have -- believe have been considered. Some of them were mentioned tonight by the Warden. I truly believe that cumulative impacts of a variety of these small projects could accomplish the same goal as a temperature curtain. And therefore I request that the temperature curtain be totally taken off the table.

Finally, I would like to see an independent science review of this entire project. PG&E has a number of scientific studies going on, but I think it's time for the people to have a scientific review that represents the total nonpartial point of view.

And I suggest that the National Academy of Sciences be contacted and brought onboard to review this entire issue, the issue both of the positive and negative benefits of a thermal curtain or the cumulative effect of all the alternatives.

Finally, you had mentioned that if the license is approved that we can go in later and amend that license. It is my understanding, through working with politics and many other organizations and groups, that once something is signed, once something is a done deal, it is not easy to go in and amend and is a total uphill battle.

So I would like, rather than to work on amending things after things are completed and signed on to, I would like to have the entire community agree to what we can go forward on, and move forward on those types of things.

Thank you.

VOICE: Yes.

(Applause.)

MR. WILLHOIT: My name is Michael Willhoit. I'm a member of the 2105 Committee. I've lived here for ten years, visited here for 30 years. And I'm going to divert just a little bit from the thermal curtain, but I'll come back to it.

The Collaborative accomplished a lot of good things. And most of these things were recommended in your Draft EIS, and we thank you for that.

And one of the things I want to talk about tonight is the Recreation Resource Management Plan. Since 1982, when Article 42 was added to the existing license, a recreation management plan has been required. It hasn't

happened.

For the past nine years your agency has waived the implementation of such a plan pending relicensing. Finally we've arrived at a good plan, but since the signing of the Settlement Agreement in April of this year, a problem has arisen. And that's the delays in the issuance of the license that we see now.

And you mentioned in your introduction some of the things that we're looking at, the CEQA review, as well as the 401 certificate. It's clear to us that the license won't happen for one, two, or three more years, the way things stand right now. But while we were negotiating in the Collaborative, we were given assurances by PG&E that we would see a timely license in November of this year. We could expect it. FERC would be in a position to issue this license.

So what I'm asking now on behalf of the Committee is that FERC takes a second look at the Recreation Resource Plan and amends the timeframes for the items that were agreed upon. And I'm specifically thinking of three categories.

First, maintenance. It's mainly overdue maintenance.

Second, the improvements: Handicapped access. And,

Third, the new facilities.

Now each one of these has with it a timespan. And, simply, we're asking that you help us achieve time parity. And we're not asking for anything to be speeded up. But if a license were issued in November of 2004, something that was slated in the plan to be implemented in one to three years would be implemented no later than 2007. So we're asking you to change the date so that all the items are done in that manner.

Now back to the maintenance. I have over here an example of what we think is overdue maintenance. And there are many items that are listed in terms of maintenance: Water faucets, Klamath stoves, vault toilets, undeclared trails and such. But this particular thing right here happens to be -- and I have to explain this to you. This is the Almanor Scenic Overlook, and there is no more scenic in this. This used to look out upon Mount Lassen. It had a beautiful view of the lake.

Now this vegetation didn't grow there in the last two years. This certainly happened over a period of time. So items like that we would like you to accelerate and require that they be done, if not now, because they should have been done earlier, that they be done very promptly.

It's not a money issue, for sure. We know that this project is worth $2 billion over the life of the

project in 2004 dollars. And PG&E can come up with the money to do these minor maintenance items. They did come up with $87 million this year for bonuses for 17 of their executives, so we'd like to see those speeded up.

(Laughter.)

MR. WILLHOIT: And, lastly, the Marvin Alexander Beach.

And, Scott, would you move to the next slide, please.

This is standing right on what is going to be Marvin Alexander Beach looking to the north. And that's the tower that we saw earlier.

Now the problem is if this environmental nightmare of a thermal curtain would, by some chance, happen, the anchors would be right in the middle of Marvin Alexander Beach.

Scott, the next slide.

I'm standing yesterday at 360 feet. That's where the southern anchor would be, and that's Marvin Alexander Beach, and that's where the arrow points. So what we're asking is that if, if, in the chance that this thing happens, we see an alternative Marvin Alexander Beach.

Marvin was a very instrumental part in this process and recreation development was his cause. And unfortunately he can't be here to see the dedication of this

beach. And we want to see this beach clean without a curtain.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. SEANDEL: Good evening. I am now speaking for myself. My name is Aaron Seandel, S-e-a-n-d-e-l. My wife and I have lived in the Lake Almanor Basin on a full-time basis since 1994 and we've been coming here since 1972.

We are very active in the community. I am a member of the Plumas County 2105 Committee and have been working, along with the other members of the Collaborative, in all phases of the development of the Settlement Agreement.

I'm also Chair of the Plumas County Committee on Water Quality. And I will speak to that in my remarks, the issues I'm going to comment on.

Going through the presentation, I'm just going to hit the highlights because so many of these things have been said. But I would agree, for example, with the comments that were made regarding page 20 in the Executive Summary about making evaluation prior to and after any modifications of the Prattville Intake. To me that assumes that something's going to happen regardless, and then you're going to evaluate. And that is of a real concern to a lot

of us, that language.

On page 41 I have a disagreement. And I know that this isn't something that FERC is directly involved with, but I just want to make it public. I have a disagreement with a designation of the Feather River as a cold, fresh water habitat based upon the information that we have. And I want that as a part of the record, please.

On page 47 we have data that we've been participating in the Collaborative that maintaining a mean water temperature of 20 degrees through the implementation of the Prattville Intake modifications cannot be met during dry and critically dry years. It's been -- we've discussed that thoroughly. And that "critically dry and dry years" has occurred at least or close to 50 percent of the past 33 years.

On page 67, line 11, I have agreement that the water quality monitoring plan should be adaptive on project-related water quality conditions. However, one of the things that I'm concerned about is that one of the proposed modifications of the intake is considering the removal of 42,000 cubic yards of silt. And there isn't any provision at all in any documentation to this point of how to deal with that as it relates to water quality. And that is a critical issue.

Page 68, I disagree with line 28. And this is a

part of the monitoring program, the sampling program. Three sites, in my judgment and in the Plumas County Committee on Water Quality's judgment, are insufficient really to satisfactorily monitor a lake of this size.

Currently the Plumas County Water Quality Program has identified 17 different sites in the lake. And I just want to refresh your memory about the -- when you saw the map of the lake, how the different elevations and the different configuration of the lake really, really in our judgment almost requires that you look at more than just three sites, because three is just too global for a lake that is as diverse as we are right now, as the lake is now.

I disagree, page 69, we have disagreement with the five-year monitoring program proposed by the licensee. With the rapid growth in the number of homes, the increase in the number of developments around the lake, the additional recreation sites around the lake that are included in the Settlement Agreement, and the increased number of tourists that visit the lake every year and increasing every year, conducting a sampling program every five years could easily miss trends and places the sampling program as one that reacts to problems rather than one that is proactive to trends. Five years is too long between sampling events in project-related waters.

We recommend that three years be the maximum

between the required events. And using the sampling events that are noted in Table 3, I believe it's on page 69, I'm not sure of that, but I think that's correct.

We have agreement with the Bacteriological Sampling Program, pages 71 and 72. Agreement with the analysis that the modification of the Prattville Intake could substantially alter the thermal regimes of Lake Almanor and Butt Valley Reservoir. There's certainly no disagreement with that.

We have disagreement with the language in lines 3 through 10, "would monitor the impacts and corrective actions, if necessary, could be made within a few years of implementing the new license." What this suggests to me is that a problem is created, then you do some modification after the license is implemented. And that is not -- I don't think that's a practical way of approaching this.

On page 75 we have disagreement. PG&E has only conducted feasibility studies for the curtain and not the reoperation of Canyon Dam Intakes or modification of Caribou 2. You've heard these before. We really would like to see and hopefully will see other alternatives being proposed. And not just single alternatives.

We are encouraging PG&E and others to look at combinations of alternatives that might work but have not been put before the deliberating body. And that, we think,

is very, very important.

We have -- let's see. We have disagreement with the Department of Interior at lines 26 to 34. You have referred to that earlier, I believe.

We have disagreement, line 5 on page 77. It talks about, again, the 20-degree mean temperature. We've talked about that.

We have agreement on line 13, page 83, PG&E being responsible for controlling any shoreline erosion caused by project operations that adversely affect water quality, aquatic resources, cultural resources, and aesthetics. Just reinforce that point.

On page 341, line 31, we have a concern; I have a concern. There is a need to identify additional sites for bacteriological monitoring on a regular basis in nonswimming areas, lakeshore sites that are very close to the east shore. And we talked about a little bit about that when we talked about the raising of the lake back in 1972.

On line 11, we think that Plumas County needs to be specifically named along with -- excuse me -- the other agencies in all matters related to management. In this particular line it is not, as a part of -- that was page 343. 343.

Disagreement. This has to do with the comment on line 5 about not monitoring through the life of the license.

And we feel very strongly that with the continuing growth in the area and the increase in recreational facilities that will be available throughout the new license, along with a number of visitors, tourists increasing every year, we recommend that license continue through the term of the license -- excuse me -- sampling, water quality sampling continue through the life of the license.

We agree with the water levels for Lake Almanor and Butt Valley Reservoir.

And, finally, again, we are concerned about the potential septic leakage that can occur through the shoreline erosion issues.

We thank you very much. We appreciate the time that you are spending with us. And that concludes my remarks.

(Applause.)

MR. MUDRE: Thank you very much.

I have a question. Is Melany Johnson still here?

MS. JOHNSON: Yes.

MR. MUDRE: Because you had indicated that you wanted to speak, and we hadn't heard from you. So I wanted to make sure that --

MR. DeSPAIN: And also Mike DeSpain.

MR. MUDRE: Okay. Let's get -- I thought he was on the list. We'll get you right next.

MS. JOHNSON: Okay.

MR. MUDRE: I just wanted to make sure that everyone that wanted, that signed up, got a chance to speak.

MS. JOHNSON: Thank you. I'm Melany Johnson, M-e-l-a-n-y. I'm Mountain Maidu. I'm the Cultural Technician for Susanville Indian Rancheria Environmental Protection Department. And I am here on behalf of the Susanville Indian Rancheria Tribal Business Council and the Susanville Indian Rancheria Tribal Government Liaison Committee.

Our Tribal Chairman, Stacy Dixon, planned on being here tonight, but was unable to attend due to unforeseen circumstances.

The Susanville Indian Rancheria, SIR, is a federally-recognized Indian Tribe with ancestral ties to the Mountain Maidu, Wadatkuta, and Kamotkuta Bands of the Northern Paiute, Hamawi, and Aporige Bands of the Pit River and the Northern Washoe.

In 1913 the Hydraulic Fill Dam was constructed on the North Fork of the Feather River south of Big Meadows. Once the largest meadow in California, inundating thousands of years of traditional, cultural history practiced by the Mountain Maidu Indians. This resulted in a water-storage reservoir and recreational facility now referred to as Lake Almanor.

For the Mountain Maidu people this event was catastrophic. Now as if it were not enough to destroy a significant portion of the history, culture, and homeland of a people indigenous to the area, the powers that be literally proposed to dredge up the ancestors and history of these people and ship them down a pipe to Oroville through the creation of a thermal curtain at the Prattville Intake.

When will the insensitivity and the lack of respect cease?

Professor Emeritus Makoto Kowta of the Chico State Department of Anthropology, in his Report of Archeological Field Reconnaissance of the Lake Almanor shoreline and the late U.C. Berkeley Field Anthropologist Francis Riddell in his manuscript, "Ethnographic Villages at Lake Almanor," have both documented village sites within the area of potential effect for the proposed thermal curtain project.

The influential American Anthropologist Alfred L. Kroeber in his handbook, The Indians of California, stated that Maidu cemeteries lay at the edge of villages in order to guard against grave robbery. Thus, this project has significant potential to result in the excavation and removal of Native American human remains and objects.

Because the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, FERC, a federal agency, is the lead agency with regard to

environmental oversight; and because Lake Almanor is considered a Waters of the United States, protected by the Clean Water Act and under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, this project is subject to the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, NGPRA.

Section (3)(c) 225 U.S.C. 3002(c)(2) states, "The intentional removal from or excavation of Native American cultural items from federal or Tribal lands for purposes of discovery, study, or removal of such items is permitted only if such items are excavated and removed after consultation with the appropriate Indian Tribes."

Furthermore, California Public Resource Code Section 5097.9 states: "No public agency and no private party using or occupying public property or operating on public property under a public license, permit, grant, lease, or contract made to honor after July 1st, 1977 shall in any manner whatsoever cause severe or irreparable damage to any Native American sanctified cemetery, place of worship, religious or ceremonial site, or sacred shrine located on public property except on a clear and convincing showing that the public interest and necessity so require it."

In conclusion, both federal and state law prohibit the proposed project unless consultation takes place with the Indian Tribes and the project is clearly and

convincingly necessary and in the best interests of the public.

I thank you for the opportunity to comment tonight. And the Tribal Business Council looks forward to developing government-to-government consultation in accordance with FERC's Tribal Policy Statement, Docket Number PL034000, in order to resolve conflicts resulting from FERC's Relicensing Project 2105 in 1962.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

MS. HOPTON FOOTE: Good evening. Thank you for your patience. You said earlier that you were here to balance the pros and cons. And I was grateful to hear that. My name is Nancy Hopton, H-o-p-t-o-n, Foote, F-o-o-t-e. And I'm sparing you the words of 3,075 people who have signed this petition as a con.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. DeSPAIN: My name is Michael DeSpain, Tribal Environmental Protection Agency Director, Greenville Rancheria.

I have letters here -- excuse me -- that have been received in Washington, D.C. And I also spoke with Washington, D.C., Mr. Rawley Wilson, the Tribal Liaison, this afternoon before the meeting.

Here it is: Copies of cultural maps that you are to -- there are the two -- go back and discuss when you get back to Washington, D.C. in reference to this. Excuse me.

I'll briefly read some of the stuff that is in this from the Tribe. The Greenville Rancheria of Maidu Indians has concerns regarding the FERC 2105 Lake Almanor and Butt Valley Reservoir. During the first stages of consultations, dated 23 July and 4 September, 2002, letters were drafted and sent to different agencies. From that point FERC did not have any further communications with the Greenville Rancheria after the initial scoping process and consultations.

Issues brought to FERC's attentions were not addressed. The Tribe's concerns are now two parts: The environmental impact on Lake Almanor and Butt Valley Reservoir is a major concern. These two bodies of water are very important to the local environment. They have great numbers of fish, mammals, water fowl, invertebrates, birds of prey, as well as Native American gathering sites.

I cannot specifically, and I apologize to the public, share any of those gathering sites or cultural sites. On the maps that FERC now has in possession with coordination through Plumas County, shows birds of prey nesting sites around the lake and cultural sites for the entire Big Meadows or Lake Almanor Basin and Butt Valley

Reservoir system itself.

To continue: In FERC's Draft EIS they discuss the water temperature from Mountain Meadows Reservoir as to locals Walker Lake to Yellow Creek. Items that are not addressed: The damage that will be done to the gathering sites within the project boundaries, and the dropping of water temperature and its effects to the ecological system along the Feather River.

If thermal curtains are in place within the boundaries of Lake Almanor, the cold-water fishery will decrease, and so will other animals, birds, and the entire ecological system. The Greenville Rancheria has concerns about thermal curtains, the size of the curtains, the aesthetics, the lack of data that is present in the Draft EIS.

I also sat in on the 2105 Committee meeting this past Thursday. Issues I brought up, ideas, to not even think about these curtains -- excuse me -- and hopefully they will be developed further down the line.

FERC speaks about the recreation agencies that were involved in the initial consultation meetings, but not a single phrase in the planning process for Indian Tribes in respect to Native grounds. As a federally-recognized Tribe between Susanville and Greenville Rancheria, that is a federal government to a federal government and sovereign

nations. So any consultations according to Section 106 has to be dealt with. No consultations have been developed between these two Tribes and FERC since 2002. And that is in your Draft EIS.

The Greenville Rancheria has concerns in -- excuse me -- in reference to the cultural aspects of Lake Almanor Basin and Butt Valley Reservoir. The Draft EIS reports numerous cultural and historical sites. The proposed curtains would destroy cultural sites within Lake Almanor and Butt Valley Reservoir. At the present time Greenville Rancheria members have shown concern about cultural sites within project boundaries.

The Greenville Rancheria has contacted the Native American Heritage Commission and the United States Forest Service requesting additional data in reference FERC 2105. The Greenville Rancheria should have been consulted during the entire project, not just the scoping.

And understanding the FERC 2100 also ties in with the 2105 from Lake Oroville and up the North Fork of the Feather River, the thought of dropping the water temperature along the North Fork of the Feather River should have received deliberation during the construction of Oroville Dam by the Department of Water Resources and the State of California.

The last paragraph, as I apologized, is from the

Greenville Rancheria. It can be publicized at their convenience.

And on a personal note, the studies that PG&E have done and reported to the 2105 Commission is like every other study: They come up for three or four days. They are not here on a weekly or daily basis.

I'm also a professional California hunting and fishing guide. I spend a lot of time on these waters. The studies are incorrect, and they're not -- there's not enough data for them.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. MUDRE: Thank you.

Is there anyone who has signed up to speak who hasn't yet spoken?

Okay. She raised her hand first, and then we'll get to you.

VOICE: We have another one here.

MR. MUDRE: Okay.

VOICE: Hey, John, I don't want anybody to go home yet. We have to put away chairs when we get all through.

(Laughter.)

MS. SLUSHER: Good evening, everyone. My name is Constance Slusher. And that's spelled S-, as in Sam,

l-u-s-h-e-r. I am not a committee member. I do not belong to any organization. I am a 25-year resident of Lake Almanor. I am a business owner with two businesses. I employ people in Chester. I provide health insurance to those people and their families.

What you are proposing to do to our community is to kill it. You're proposing to put a thermal curtain that would destroy our tourism. The federal government has already destroyed our logging industry by the Northern Spotted Owl Report that now we know was bogus.

The California governor at one point in time took our money from our lottery and put it -- that was supposed to be for our schools -- and put it in the General Fund. Our schools have suffered because of logging, not having the income from the logging. Our community has just about died because all the logging companies have closed or have gotten smaller.

Our community is dying. And if we don't do something to keep Lake Almanor as we know it, we will cease to exist. I moved up here 25 years ago as a young woman to raise a family, because this is where I wanted to be: Away from the city.

This is a wonderful community. And what we were hearing tonight, all's we heard was what the thermal curtain was going to propose to do to Lake Almanor. If there was

any serious consideration by PG&E to do anything else other than the thermal curtain, why did we not hear it tonight? This was their opportunity to bring forth those positions.

I'm asking, I'm begging for the Commission to please not allow the thermal curtains and to allow the Chester Lake Almanor Basin and Butt Lake to survive the way it is.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. FORDING: My name is Richard Fording, F-o-r-d-i-n-g. And I'm speaking as a property owner with legal rights under the Red River Deed. And I'm doing this to assure these rights aren't overlooked by FERC in their process. The deed was between the Great Western Power Company and the Red River Lumber Company in 1927, before PG&E acquired the Great Western Power Company and Lake Almanor.

The deed extended to Red River's successors, lessees, and assigns. And there are now thousands of property owners who have rights confirmed by that deed.

Ingress and egress for boating, hunting, fishing, and other recreation on the waters of both said reservoirs, Lake Almanor and Butt Valley Reservoir, on page 248, lines 9 through 13, the document states, "Under the terms and conditions of the project license, PG&E must retain all

rights to lands and waters within the project boundary needed for the project purposes. PG&E may permit others to use the project's land and waters, but before permitting such use PG&E must ensure that it does not endanger the health, create a nuisance, or otherwise be incompatible with the overall project recreational use."

Simply put, PG&E does not have all the rights to the lands and water. These were encumbered before the current license and before PG&E owned the lakes. The current property owners' successors have gone to great lengths to help PG&E meet the terms of the license and ensuring that it does not endanger health, create a nuisance, or otherwise be incompatible with the overall project recreational use.

The owners have also spent nearly $30,000 in legal fees to preserve their rights under the Red River Deed and are prepared to do again if needed. However, they prefer to work cooperatively with PG&E, as they have, to help them meet the terms of the license while maintaining their property rights under the Red River Deed.

We respectfully request that the deed be memorialized in the license in order that future administrators will understand that neither PG&E nor the U.S. Government can unilaterally cancel the benefits of the deeds.

And, lastly, I'd like to thank you for your flexibility this evening you've extended to us in allowing us to fully express our concerns.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. WING: My name is Ed Wing. I started vacationing up here, my wife and I did in the early '60s. We ended up buying a piece of property and have lived here full time since 1990.

Since FERC is working closely with the State Water Resources Control Board, and all's I'm going to do right now is read a letter that I've just written to the State Water Board in response to a reply I got from letters that were protesting the installation of the three thermal curtains. And I'll leave you a copy of their letter also so you can see some of this, what I'm going to write will make more sense after you've read their response.

Their response was from Victoria A. Whitney, the Division Chief of the State Water Resources Control Board. And my letter is as follows:

"Dear Ms. Whitney,

"Thank you for your comprehensive letter. We wish to respond on several points:

"Your comment that the environmental health of Lake Almanor will be considered in all the endless studies,

however nothing is said about Butt Valley Reservoir. It has not even been disputed by anyone that the two thermal curtains at Butt Valley Lake will destroy the trophy trout fisheries that now exist there.

"You state that the earlier agreement between PG&E and" Department of Fish and Game "did recommend the Prattville Thermal Curtain. This is" a hundred percent "wrong. The FERC Draft EIS of November 1996 specifically stated that they were opposed to the installation of the thermal curtain and that the water temperature was not the limiting factor in the trout population in the lower river reaches. We feel that the political pressure from Cal Trout and others caused this scientific review to be ignored. Also do not forget that the hydrology study done at the "University" of Iowa specifically stated that the results of the thermal curtains on Shasta and Whiskytown lakes was not transferable to Almanor because Almanor is a shallow water lake.

"We also believe that there is no scientific evidence before 1915" and the building of Canyon Dam, that the North Fork of the Feather River "was a cold water river during late summer. The Middle Fork [of the] Feather River is a very comparable river that, as you know, is protected as a 'Wild [and] Scenic River' and has [never had any] dams. It is also feed by" snowpack -- by "snowmelt in the spring

and large natural springs in the late summer. The middle fork has temperatures well above 20" degrees Centigrade in the summertime.

"Why must the process be allowed to move forward with endless studies being paid for by the PG&E ratepayers and the California tax payers? There is already overwhelming evidence that the three thermal curtains will do irreparable [harm] to Lake Almanor and Butt Valley at a cost of $53,000,000, and this is the clincher -- it won't even work at all in dry and drought years, which is almost half of the time [now]."

And you may think that this remark's tongue in cheek, but it's not. I'm dead serious about this.

"Consider the following:

"Let's suppose next year Cal Trout or others tell the Lake Tahoe authorities," go to the Lake Tahoe authorities and say "that the trout in the Truckee River," now they're not dying or anything, but they "would like to have a little cooler water in August. So" -- they should dredge [up] 42,000 cubic yards of muck off the...bottom" of Lake Tahoe, install a 900-by-760-foot "thermal curtain; pile this muck up on the beach at Tahoe City, and spend $53,000,000 doing it. Oh, and by the way there are sacred Native American sites in the dredging [area], and it will only help the Truckee River trout a little bit," one degree

Centigrade and "every other year."

"The above plan would be immediately discarded as absurd! But you know what, the Prattville temperature modification plan is just as absurd.

"Enough is enough.

"Sincerely,

"Ed Wing, Chester."

(Applause.)

MR. MURPHY: Thank you. Thanks for your perseverance, all of you. I'm John Murphy. I am a Plumas County taxpayer, a PG&E ratepayer, and I'm a fisherman. I want you to know I strongly oppose the proposed thermal curtains. There is potential damage to Lake Almanor fisheries that we've heard about. And the longterm major cost to the taxpayers and ratepayers is wrong.

The data of the presentation I am giving you comes from the data on the 2105 website, primarily from Fish and Game and from PG&E reports. The July-August average water temperatures in the Rock Creek and Cresta reaches routinely range from 20, approximately, to 22 degrees C.

Fish and Game is apparently committed to trout habitat enhancement in the Rock Creek-Cresta reaches by attempting to maintain average water temperatures at a maximum of 20 degrees. While that sounds reasonable, one of the reports says that the trout at 20 degrees C have an

80-percent probability of survival. If the temperatures drop to 19 degrees C, they have a hundred-percent probability of survival.

Perhaps 20 degrees is not really what is wanted, but lower. The Fish and Game plan to lower average water temperature some 20 to 40 miles downstream by drawing the coolest water from shallow Lake Almanor is at best a poorly-conceived plan.

Fish and Game's engineering model data predict a July-August average water temperature in that Rock Creek-Cresta area with two thermal curtains to be about 18 degrees to 20.6 degrees in an average year. We've already heard about how many times we can have an average year.

From an engineering standpoint there is no margin for error. If their assumptions are correct, we will still pay -- incorrect -- we still pay for their experiment.

As an engineer and former program manager, I would neither design nor attempt to build a system that could not meet the customer's goals. In producing this mandate, it would seem that Fish and Game is desperately grasping at straws, hoping that this experiment might just work. Sound engineering is not based on hope. Fish and Game does not pay for this experiment; we do.

If the Lake Almanor thermal curtain is implemented, the character of our lake will surely change.

The thermal curtain will continually withdraw the coolest water from the lake yearlong, to lower July and August downstream temperatures.

With a warmer lake, can we expect the loss of cold-water fish? Can we expect an algae bloom? Can we expect the growth of new flora on the shoreline? I sincerely hope the Federal Regulatory Energy Commission will show the backbone to refuse the Fish and Game mandate, which would deplete the coolest water from Lake Almanor and Butt Lake in order to do an experiment in establishing trout habitat in the Rock Creek-Cresta reaches of the North Fork of the Feather River.

The future of our lake's in your hands.

(Applause.)

MR. MUDRE: Okay. Is there anyone else that has any comments that they'd like to give?

This gentleman. And just for...

MR. WRIGHT: If I may.

MR. MUDRE: If we could have a show of hands of other people -- if we weren't up against the time for the room, but I think we're going to have this done right. Does anyone besides this gentleman want to give comments?

Okay. We're in good shape then.

MR. WRIGHT: I thank you. My name is Walter Wright. I retired and moved to this Lake Almanor in 1989,

had my properties improved and built at that particular time.

But as the gentleman spoke earlier this evening on alternative methods to cool that water downstream at the Rock Creek. I'm a cryogenic technician. I spent many years with Union Carbide Lending Division. Now as a suggestion, understand this as a suggestion, and the suggestion will not involve any endangerment or any tampering with our lake -- I'm strictly opposed to do that -- but I would highly recommend, and the government has the money to do this and PG&E has their connections with the government, being a cryogenic technician, your liquified oxygen -- and they talk about oxidation in the water and lowering the temperature. Your liquified oxygen is 280 degrees. That's below zero. All right?

Now there's the LN2, liquified nitrogen, which is 320 on up, on up, clear up to your helium, which is 453. Now I would recommend that they take into thought and consideration a liquified oxygen division at the point where they can release this liquified oxygen into the water.

Now this is an oxidizer. And the boiling point, as I said, is 280 degrees. If you put that raw oxygen, which is known as "LOx," directly into the flow of this water, it is going to bring that temperature down to where it is reasonable and agreeable. And the cost will be far

less than what we're looking at today through the proposal plan.

I thank you for listening to me.

(Applause.)

MR. MUDRE: All right. Thank you very much. Is there a Christine Berry here?

(No response.)

MR. MUDRE: Okay. Well, it looks like everybody who has signed up, and we've just asked, and there's no one else here who has any comments right now. If you think of something that you want to provide to us, we will be accepting written comments until November 1st. And you can send them in.

I want to thank everyone for coming out tonight. I think it's very a productive meeting. We're going to have another tomorrow down in Chico. Maybe we'll see some of you down there. But, again, thanks for coming. We're going to -- we've got the transcripts -- or we'll have the transcripts here. We're going to take all this information into account.

And, again, thanks for coming.

(Applause.)

(The meeting was adjourned at 8:53 p.m.)

CERTIFICATE OF OFFICIAL REPORTER

This is to certify that the attached proceedings before the FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION in the Matter of:

Name of Proceeding: COMMENTS on DRAFT EIS for the UPPER NORTH FORK FEATHER RIVER PROJECT, CALIFORNIA

Project No.: 2105

Place: CHESTER, CALIFORNIA

Date: TUESDAY, OCTOBER 19, 2004

were held as herein appears, and that this is the original transcript thereof for the file of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, and is a full correct transcription of the proceedings.

Nancy Palmer,
Official Reporter